

21796

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 22

being. For 10 years he has been voting against the farmer in the Congress.

Look at his record.

Senator GOLDWATER voted against the feed grain programs in 1961, 1962, and 1963.

Senator GOLDWATER voted against the Agricultural Act of 1962, which authorized programs for wheat and feed grains and expanded authority for food for peace and the Farmers Home Administration.

Senator GOLDWATER has voted consistently against efforts to support and strengthen REA loan funds.

Senator GOLDWATER voted against the bill to authorize funds for public works, TVA and power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior in 1959.

Senator GOLDWATER voted against the Niagara River project to produce low cost power with preference for cooperative and other consumer electric systems in 1956.

With a record like that, is Senator GOLDWATER the man you want to trust with the destiny of American agriculture?

I don't think so.

Let me assure you of one thing: a Johnson-Humphrey administration never will abandon American agriculture. It never will reject constructive change as long as the change can be for the better.

Our criteria for judging proposed changes in American farm policy will include these 10 points:

1. Will it provide a fair return to the farmer consistent with the goal of full parity of income for farm people?

2. Will it assure an abundant supply to meet the needs of consumers at reasonable prices?

3. Will it add to the strength of the Nation in its quest for world peace, increasing prosperity, and national security?

4. Will it help the individual farmer to preserve his economic independence and to develop his talents to their fullest potential?

5. Will it permit our system of free markets to operate efficiently, fairly, and without needless handicaps?

6. Will it facilitate the expansion of our foreign trade and maintenance of a fair share of world markets for American farm products?

7. Will it encourage the full utilization of land, water, and human resources that are not needed for the agricultural production for alternative purposes more beneficial to the public interest?

8. Will it encourage conservation of our soil and water resources for future generations?

9. Will it assure us of a desirable level of reserves for our national security?

10. Will its cost to the taxpayers be commensurate with its benefits to the consumers, the national economy, and the Nation's strength in world affairs?

With these tests as our guide, I am confident that we can and will build a better future for rural America—and for all America.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has the floor. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New York without losing my right to the floor, and that I shall be recognized when the Senator from New York has finished his statement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of James G. Grunwell for permanent appointment as lieutenant in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

Edward W. Dempsey, of Missouri, to be special assistant on health and medical affairs to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works:

Maj. Gen. George H. Walker, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., of Illinois, to be Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, when the nomination of Robert Sargent Shriver came up for consideration in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I voted "present." I voted "present" not because I had any doubts about the capacity of Mr. Shriver to handle the job. In the first place, his capacity to handle it remains to be seen; in the second place, he is rendering a fine service as Director of the Peace Corps. So we had every reason to suppose that he could carry over his talents to perform the task which the war on poverty program involved.

My problem is a different one. Mr. Shriver proposes to retain his position as Director of the Peace Corps at the same time he would hold the position—if his nomination is confirmed, as it undoubtedly will be—as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Before I speak of my own views on this subject, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that Senators on the majority side entertained exactly the same reservations.

Senators will note from the record of the hearings on the nomination which is before them that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] said on page 10:

Mr. Shriver, my opinion, for what it is worth, in reference to the matter of holding two directorships, the Peace Corps and the economic opportunity program, is that President Johnson will not ask you to hold both positions. That is my personal feeling. Since it has been a matter of comment and colloquy here today, I would like to have the record indicate my feeling in this regard.

Mr. President, an important point was made, it seems to me by a member of the majority, with respect to the very thing that is troubling me. I also received support from the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] on my own side of the aisle. He said:

However, I do share Senator JAVITS' reservations as to one man's ability, regardless of his competence to administer both of these two vitally important programs. I hope that you will give serious consideration to your ability to do that and will make your position known to the President.

The difference between Mr. Shriver and myself, which the RECORD will show was a trying one, lay in the fact that Mr. Shriver sought to convince the committee—and myself—on the question of holding both positions. Incidentally, he said each was a full-time task. He said that specifically. I asked him, on page 3 of the record:

Do you consider being the head of the poverty program a part-time job?

Mr. SHRIVER. I see. No; I do not consider the head of the poverty program as being a part-time job.

I asked him the same question about the Peace Corps. He said practically the same thing with respect to that. The difference between Mr. Shriver and myself, as it developed at the hearing, was that Mr. Shriver insisted that it was up to